

Attachment 1

One omission in my earlier email of the same title - the separate disaggregations of SBC Winback and CLEC-to-CLEC added to the measures will be implemented effective with March 2003 results reported in April 2003, assuming agreement is reached on the PM changes.

As discussed Wednesday afternoon 3/19, attached please find the revised versions of the approved version 1.9 PMs MI 13 and MI 13.1. What has been added is the two disaggregations for SBC Winback line losses and CLEC-to-CLEC line losses. A third disaggregation, the combination of those two, will be reported and will be subject to remedy. I received no additional edits, and believe these were the agreed-to edits.

<<MI 13 and MI 13_1 Revised 0321.doc>>

Also, in that meeting a request was made to review the Data Flow Diagram (DFD) and Data Element Map (DEM) for these two PMs. Those documents are not completed at this time, as they are not required for the development and implementation of the new PMs MI 13 and MI 13.1. They will be updated (for PM MI 13) and created new (for PM MI 13.1) subsequent to the implementation of the new PMs on April 20, 2003.

Jim Ehr

Director - Performance Measurements
SBC Ameritech External Affairs
Work: (847) 248-4375
Pager: (847) 684-6161
Fax: (847) 248-3890
Email Text Page: 8476846161@airmessage.net

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of SBC Communications and/or affiliates, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at 847-248-4375 and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

Attachment 2

**Joint Supplemental Declaration of Karen W. Moore
and Timothy M. Connolly**

Attachment 2



Performance Measurement Documentation (PMD)

SBC Ameritech Performance Measurement X

Version 1.0

Last Updated xx/yy/yyyy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Version 1.0</u>	i
<u>1.</u>	<u>DOCUMENT INFORMATION</u>	1
<u>2.</u>	<u>BUSINESS RULE DOCUMENTATION</u>	2
<u>3.</u>	<u>DATA FLOW DIAGRAM (DFD #)</u>	2
<u>4.</u>	<u>PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT DATA ELEMENT MAPPING (DEM #)</u>	2
<u>5.</u>	<u>MEASURE SPECIFIC BUSINESS / TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (BTR #)</u> ...	2
<u>6.</u>	<u>NON-MEASURE SPECIFIC SYSTEMS PROCESSING (NMP SYSTEM)</u>	3
<u>7.</u>	<u>DATA RETENTION POLICIES (DRP SYSTEM)</u>	3

1. DOCUMENT INFORMATION

This document was created for the purpose of identifying Performance Measurement 107 specific reporting elements.

Document History

Version	Issue Date	Author	Summary of Changes

2. Business Rule Documentation

Information detailing the business rules, exclusions, calculations, disaggregations, and other relevant aspects of this measure are available within Ameritech's Performance Measurement User Guide. This documentation is available as follows:

Reference Material	Reference Location
Ameritech Performance Measurements Business Rules	https://clec.sbc.com

3. Data Flow Diagram (DFD #)

A high-level diagram depicting the flow of information from the various source systems through the performance measurement reporting systems has been provided under the following delivery history:

Reference Material	Material Provided

4. Performance Measurement Data Element Mapping (DEM #)

Identification of the data elements required for the creation of the measure and a mapping of those data elements to their respective source systems has been provided under the following delivery history:

Reference Material	Material Provided

5. Measure Specific Business / Technical Requirements (BTR #)

Measure specific business and technical requirements apply for the following systems and have been provided under the following delivery history:

Reference Material	Material Provided

6. Non-Measure Specific Systems Processing (NMP_System)

Further detail of the non-measure system specific general processing requirements have been provided:

Reference #	System Reference Material	Material Provided

7. Data Retention Policies (DRP_System)

Detail on the data retention policies and procedures for the involved systems has been provided:

Reference #	System Reference Material	Material Provided

Attachment 3

**Joint Supplemental Declaration of Karen W. Moore
and Timothy M. Connolly**

Attachment 3

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM [mailto:kwmooore@att.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2003 7:50 AM
To: WESTCOTT, ANN (AIT)
Cc: Deyoung, Sārah
Subject: RE: PM MI 13

Ann:

Will the raw data supplied by SBC on Wednesday contain state indicators for the 25% of records that do not contain a state reference?

Will September and October raw data be supplied? If yes, when can I expect to receive it?

Thank you for your help.

Karen Moore
AT&T
708 579-3108

Attachment 4

**Performance Measurements Affected By Inaccuracies In SBC's
Data Flow Diagrams And Data Element Maps**

4	OSS Interface Availability
5	Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned Within "X" Hours
5.2	Percentage of Unsolicited FOCs by Reason Code
6	Average Time to Return FOC
7	Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
7.1	Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Day of Work Completion
8	Average Time to Return Mechanized Completions
9	Percent Rejects
10	Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within 1 Hour of Reject in MOR
10.1	Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2	Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
10.3	Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
10.4	Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects
11.1	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects That Are Received Via An Interface
11.2	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects That Are Received Thru the Manual Process
13	Order Process Percent Flow Through
13.1	Total Order Process Percent Flow Through
14	Billing Accuracy
19	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness
25	Local Operations Center (LOC) Grade of Service (GOS)
71	Common Transport Trunk Group Blockage
91	Percent of LNP Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines
92	Percentage of Time the Old Service Provider Releases the Subscription Prior to the Expiration of the Second 9 Hours (T2) Timer
93	Percentage of Customer Accounts Restructured by the LNP Due Date
95	Average Response Time for Non-Mechanized Rejects Returned with Complete and Accurate Codes

**Performance Measurements Affected By Inaccuracies In SBC's
Data Flow Diagrams And Data Element Maps**

99	Average Delay Days for Ameritech Missed Due Dates (For Stand-Alone LNP Orders)
104.1	The Average Time it Takes to Unlock the 911 record
111	Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLEC
113	Percentage of Electronic Updates that Flow Through the Update Process Without Manual Intervention
115.2	Mean Time To Restore – Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)
120	Percentage of Requests Processed Within 30 Business Days
121	Percentage of Quotes Provided for Authorized BFRs Within 45 Business Days
CW1	Average Delay in Original FOCs Due Date to Delay Notices
CW6	FMOD Process: Percent of Form A Received Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission
CW7	FMOD Process: Percent of Forms B, C, D, and E Received Within 72 Hours of Form A
CW8	FMOD Process: Percent of Form B Returned FOC With New Due Date Within 24 Hours
CW9	FMOD Process: Percent of Form C Return Quote Within the Interval Ordered by the Commission
MI 2	Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices Within 24 Hours of the Due Date
MI 6	Erred Customer Record Update Files Not Returned by Next Business Day
MI 9	Percentage Missing FOCs
MI 13	Percent Loss Notification Within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion

Attachment 5

**Joint Supplemental Declaration of Karen W. Moore
and Timothy M. Connolly**

Attachment 5

Issue Type	Number	Issue Date	Status	Issue Description
O	440	5/6/2002	CLOSED	Ameritech used inaccurate data in the calculation of Performance Measurement 97 ("Percentage of time Ameritech applies the 10-digit trigger prior to the LNP Order Due Date").
O	495	6/3/2002	CLOSED	Ameritech inaccurately transformed unprocessed data into processed data that was used in the calculation of 44 Provisioning and Maintenance and Repair performance measures1 for January and February 2002.
O	497	6/5/2002	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech does not accurately post results for the EDI LSOG 4/CORBA disaggregation of Performance Measurement 2 ("Percent Responses Received Within "X" Seconds – OSS Interfaces").
O	584	7/29/2002		SBC Ameritech is using inaccurate data in the calculation of Performance Measures 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 hour of receipt of reject in Mor") and 11 ("Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects").
O	619	8/24/2002	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech's January, February, and March 2002 performance measurement data are missing orders used in the calculation of Performance Measurement 58 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates").
O	638	9/6/2002		SBC Ameritech's January, February, and March 2002 performance measurement data is missing preorders used in the calculation of Performance Measurement 2 ("Percent Responses Received Within "X" Seconds – OSS Interfaces").
O	737	12/10/2002		SBC Ameritech appears to be using inaccurate data in its calculation of Performance Measurements 114 ("Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)"), 114.1 ("CHC LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval"), and 115 ("Percentage of Ameritech caused delayed Coordinated Cutovers") for the months of January through March 2002.
O	757	12/17/2002	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech's January, February, and March 2002 performance measurement data is missing orders used in the calculation of Performance Measurement 59 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation").
O	766	12/20/2002	CLOSED	Data fields in SBC Ameritech's processed records for Performance Measurement 119 ("Mean Time to Repair") appear to be inconsistent with those in the unprocessed records from SBC Ameritech's source systems for the January 2002 reporting month.
O	767	12/20/2002		Data fields in SBC Ameritech's processed records for Performance Measurement IN 1 ("Percent Loop Acceptance Testing Completed on or prior to the Completion Date") appear to be inconsistent with those in the unprocessed records from SBC Ameritech's source systems for the January 2002 reporting month.

**Joint Supplemental Declaration of Karen W. Moore
and Timothy M. Connolly**

Attachment 5

Issue Type	Number	Issue Date	Status	Issue Description
O	769	12/20/2002	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech appears to be using inaccurate data in the calculation of Performance Measurement 59 ("Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Installation") for the months of January, February, and March 2002.
O	770	12/20/2002	CLOSED	Data fields in SBC Ameritech's processed records for Performance Measurements 2 (Percent Responses Received within "x" Seconds), MI 10 (% Time-Out Transactions) and MI 16 (Percentage Rejected Query Notices) appear to be inconsistent with those in the unprocessed records from SBC Ameritech's source systems for the January 2002 reporting month.
O	771	12/20/2002	CLOSED	Access Service Requests (ASR) records for EELs and Dark Fiber are not included in SBC Ameritech's data used to calculate seven Ordering Performance Measurements.
O	772	12/20/2002	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech appears to be using inaccurate data in the calculation of Performance Measurement 58 ("Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates") for the months of January, February, and March 2002.
O	783	1/16/2003	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech appears to be using inaccurate data in the calculation of Performance Measurement 2 ("Percent Responses Received Within "X" Seconds – OSS Interfaces") for the months of March, April, and May 2002.
O	807	2/17/2003	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech appears to be missing troubles used in the calculation of seven (7) Maintenance and Repair performance measurements for the months of January, February, March, April and May 2002.
O	808	2/17/2003	CLOSED	SBC Ameritech appears to be missing Wisconsin orders used in the calculation of 8 Ordering performance measurements for the month of March 2002.
O	809	2/17/2003		SBC Ameritech appears to be using inaccurate data in the calculation of Performance Measurements 10 ("Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR") and 11 ("Mean Time to Return Rejects").
O	810	2/17/2003		SBC Ameritech's posted results for Performance Measurement 55.3 ("Percent xDSL - Capable Loop Orders Requiring the Removal of Load Coils and/or Repeaters") do not follow the July 2002 published metrics business rules as the TOTAL_LOOP_LENGTH field required to calculate this performance measurement is not populated.

Attachment 6

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM [mailto:kwmooore@att.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2003 1:28 PM
To: VIRTUAL DEVELOPMENT
Subject: unable to request raw data

Site Administrator,

This is the second time I have attempted to request raw data. I receive the following:
Error Diagnostic Information An error has occurred. HTTP/1.0 404 Object Not Found

Please let me know when this function will be available.

Karen Moore
AT&T
708 579-3108

Attachment 7

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 9:13 AM
To: 'VIRTUAL DEVELOPMENT'
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

Yes, I am still getting the error. Here is the URL: <https://pm.sbc.com/pm.cfm>

Karen Moore
AT&T
708 579-3108

-----Original Message-----

From: VIRTUAL DEVELOPMENT [mailto:VIRDEV@momail.sbc.com]
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 8:33 AM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

Please try again (hit the refresh button in your browser or hit back and submit again) and let us know if you are still getting the error.

ALSO, what is the exact URL to the page that generates the error below?
IE <http://ebiz.sbc.com/websos>)

Please direct all correspondence to virdev@momail.sbc.com.

Thanks,
Virtual Development

Attachment 8

From: VIRTUAL DEVELOPMENT [mailto:VIRDEV@momail.sbc.com]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2003 10:10 AM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Cc: HUKERI, PARAG (SBCSI)
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

Attachment 8

The web application developer/owner has been sent a copy of the error.
Developer/Owner, please see the error below and respond accordingly.

Please direct all correspondence to virdev@momail.sbc.com.

Thanks,
Virtual Development
<http://ebiz.sbc.com/websos>

-----Original Message-----

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM [mailto:kwmoore@att.com]
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 9:13 AM
To: VIRTUAL DEVELOPMENT
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

Yes, I am still getting the error. Here is the URL:
<https://pm.sbc.com/pm.cfm>

Karen Moore
AT&T
708 579-3108

-----Original Message-----

From: VIRTUAL DEVELOPMENT [mailto:VIRDEV@momail.sbc.com]
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 8:33 AM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

Please try again (hit the refresh button in your browser or hit back and submit again) and let us know if you are still getting the error.

ALSO, what is the exact URL to the page that generates the error below?
IE <http://ebiz.sbc.com/websos>)

Please direct all correspondence to virdev@momail.sbc.com.

Attachment 9

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2003 10:29 AM
To: 'HUKERI, PARAG (SBCSI)'
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

**Joint Supplemental Declaration of Karen W. Moore
and Timothy M. Connolly**

Attachment 9

I am trying to request raw data for SBC MI. The site says that PM 5 and 6, for Oct and Nov 2002, is available. However, I have attempted to request the data several times, and have received error messages each time.

Karen Moore
AT&T
708 579-3108

-----Original Message-----

From: HUKERI, PARAG (SBCSI) [mailto:ph1621@sbc.com]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2003 10:12 AM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

What region/state are you trying to request raw data for?

-----Original Message-----

From: VIRTUAL DEVELOPMENT
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2003 10:10 AM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Cc: HUKERI, PARAG (SBCSI)
Subject: RE: unable to request raw data

The web application developer/owner has been sent a copy of the error.
Developer/Owner, please see the error below and respond accordingly.

Please direct all correspondence to virdev@momail.sbc.com.

Thanks,
Virtual Development
<http://ebiz.sbc.com/websos>

Attachment 10

PM DATA MONTH/DATE RECEIVED

	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02	Jul-02	Aug-02	Sep-02	Oct-02	Nov-02	Dec-02
5					NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD		NOT RECD		2/6/2003	3/6/2003
28	3/29/2002	4/8/2003	5/6/2002		NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD
35	3/29/2002	4/8/2002			NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD	NOT RECD	11/25/2002	11/25/2002	NOT RECD	NOT RECD
37			5/20/2002		7/31/2002			10/16/2002	11/25/2002	11/25/2002	NOT RECD	NOT RECD
39			5/20/2002		7/31/2002			10/16/2002	11/25/2002	11/25/2002	NOT RECD	NOT RECD

Light gray shaded areas -- raw data not received

Dark gray shaded areas -- raw data are untimely

Attachment 11

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM [kwmoore@att.com]
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2003 11:05 AM
To: rb1648@sbc.com
Cc: Deyoung, Sarah; kh1548@sbc.com; Belair, Albert
Subject: FW: raw data request
Importance: High

Attachment 11

Becky:

I am sending you this email for Sarah, as she is ill - with Bronchitis, and doesn't sound good at all.

Thank you very much for reviewing the MI remedy plan provisions for raw data requests. As you (and Keith) are new to performance measures, I am sure you were not aware of the agreement between SBC and AT&T to not use the regulatory process for these requests, due to Ameritech's inability to provide raw data in the manner used by SWBT and PAC Bell. Since March, AT&T has had a standing request for raw data for fewer than 10 performance measures per month, with the agreement that ad hoc requests would be processed quickly.

Indeed, in connection with AT&T's latest request, we received the raw data for PM 39 within 5 days (without the invocation of the remedy plan, as per our agreement). But SBC has refused to provide a response in the same timeframe for MI 13 and MI 15. Given SBC's ability to quickly provide raw data for some measures, and not others, it leads me to believe that SBC is selectively deciding what raw data to send us, and when.

If our agreement to request, and for SBC to provide, raw data outside the regulatory process no longer applies, please consider this email a request for raw data (including exclusions in separate files) for all of AT&T's and TCG's raw data for IL, IN, MI, OH, and WI for September, October, and November 2002, for every performance measure that contains data in the given month. Please also consider this email as a request for raw data (as outlined above) every month on a going forward basis. As is clear from the remedy plan passage you cite, we are entitled to this information, and I expect to receive all of this raw data by February 15, 2003, and by the 20th of the month on a going forward basis (with the exception of MI 13 and MI 15, which should be received by February 6, 2003). Please have the appropriate SBC IT manager contact Al Belair for discussion on appropriate delivery media for this ongoing request.

If, on the other hand, SBC prefers to maintain our agreement from last year, I expect the raw data Karen requested over a week ago will be provided by COB Monday, January 27, which is a full 10 days after the initial request, and should be ample time to provide data for a mere 3 performance measures. In addition, I would like to receive raw data for PM 65 (MTTR) for TCG for IL, MI, and OH.

Please call me to discuss these arrangements.

Sarah

Becky, let me know if you have questions - Karen

Attachment 12

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2003 6:48 PM
To: 'HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT)'
Cc: KROST, BECKY (SWBT); Deyoung, Sarah, NCAM; Ann Wescott (E-mail)
Subject: RE: AT&T Request for : AT&T (LOA)-PM 35

Keith:

The PM 35 data you sent me for January does not contain the full disposition codes. Please arrange to have this data, as well as the data for TPM, send with full codes.

I thought it was clear that data in this truncated format was not sufficient for us to do accurate comparisons to our own internal data. I expect all PM repair data to be sent with full disposition codes. Please inform the SMEs preparing these files of this requirement.

Thank you very much for your help.

Karen Moore
AT&T
708 579-3108

Attachment 13

From: WESTCOTT, ANN (AIT) [mailto:aw8961@sbc.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2003 9:45 AM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM; HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT)
Cc: KROST, BECKY (SWBT); Deyoung, Sarah, CSLSM
Subject: RE: AT&T Request for : AT&T (LOA)-PM 35

Good Morning Karen,

I spoke with the person who runs this report and she will re-run January data with the full information and it will also be included on future reports. She indicated it will be available for me to send to you Monday AM.

Hope this helps.

Attachment 14

From: SHEDLOCK, MARY (SBC-MSI) [<mailto:ms2915@sbc.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 07, 2003 8:42 PM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Cc: HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT); EHR, JAMES D (SBC-MSI)
Subject: RE: Data Reconciliation

Karen,

In anticipation of our meeting, I am resending the spreadsheet that was sent for the raw data for PM39 for TCG that you should have received around 1-23-03. I have added a column to the original spreadsheet. It is column V and it is entitled "Excluded Report". An "x" in this column indicates that the trouble report was excluded from the reported results.

I have added this column to the report by applying the exclusions allowed for in the business rules: 1.) the report is not a CLEC report (use a custom filter on column T, Report_Category_Code, for report categories not equal to 1), 2.) those with a disposition > 11 (use a custom filter on column I, Disposition_Code, for disposition codes greater than 10) 3.) subsequent trouble reports (filter column Q, Subsequent_Report_Indicator equal to 1).

A report category of 1 is a customer reported trouble or CLEC trouble and would be included in the measure. Other report categories are excludable.

I have also highlighted the excluded trouble reports in yellow.

When the exclusions are applied these files match the results as reported to the web site. A count by disposition code can be obtained by sorting on

I believe the confusion is stemming from the fact that the later files that Lynn Potter of my team sent on 1-30-03, with the full disposition code only included CLEC reports (Report Category=1), not all the various report categories which were sent in the first files with all the raw data.

If you find this file helpful in answering your questions regarding the differences in the various PM39 files let me know.

I apologize for the confusion.

Attachment 15

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM [<mailto:kwmooore@att.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 17, 2003 3:31 PM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM; HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT)
Cc: EHR, JAMES D (SBC-MSI); Deyoung, Sarah, CSLSM; Belair, Albert J
(AI), CSLSM; KROST, BECKY (SWBT); SHEDLOCK, MARY (SBC-MSI); Brown,
Benjamin
Subject: RE: Data Reconciliation
Importance: High

Keith:

Attached is a spreadsheet file that contains trouble tickets culled from the November raw data. These tickets have disposition codes that don't seem to fit with UNEP troubles. We would like to start our reconciliation on Wednesday with your network folks with these tickets.

I also look forward to discussing LLNs.

Karen Moore
AT&T
708 579-3108

Attachment 16

From: HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT) [kh1548@sbc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2003 2:13 PM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Cc: SEWELL, FAY (AIT); GOMEZ-MCKEON, VIVIAN (AIT); EWING, KATHLEEN (AIT); EHR, JAMES D (SBC-MSI); SHEDLOCK, MARY (SBC-MSI); KROST, BECKY (SWBT)
Subject: Conf Call to Discuss Coding of Tickets

Attachment 16

Karen,

As you know I have been asked to arrange a conference call with AT&T and the SBC Midwest Network Team to discuss the coding of tickets.

In order to meet your needs and objectives the SBC Midwest Network Team would like to know specifically what are your objectives and desired outcomes of the meeting to discuss the coding of tickets.

This will allow the Network team to come prepared to answer any and all question you may have.

Thank you very much for "putting into words" your expectations/objectives regarding the meeting to discuss the coding of tickets. Would you kindly "REPLY TO ALL" in your response.

Thank you very much for you assistance.

Keith A. Headen
Account Manager-Industry Markets
(216) 822-5518
E-Mail: keith.a.headen@msg.ameritech.com

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of SBC Communications and/or its affiliates, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipients or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at 216-822-5518 and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

Attachment 17

From: HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT) [<mailto:kh1548@sbc.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2003 5:32 PM
To: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM
Cc: EHR, JAMES D (SBC-MSI); SHEDLOCK, MARY (SBC-MSI); EWING, KATHLEEN (AIT); KROST, BECKY (SWBT); HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT)
Subject: Data Reconciliation PM 39

Hi Karen,

After further discussion with the SBC Team....The approach/proposal for the PM 39 Data Reconciliation we would like to suggest is to do the Reconciliation DISPOSITION CODE by DISPOSITION CODE.

We would be more than happy to look at 1- 3 tickets in each disposition code. (Please advise us what tickets you would like to review and we will make arrangements to have details ready for the conference call/discussion).

Would you kindly let us know your thoughts about doing the reconciliation DISPOSITION CODE by DISPOSITION CODE and examining 1-3 tickets in each DISPOSTION CODE?

Thanks,

Keith A. Headen
Account Manager-Industry Markets
(216) 822-5518
E-Mail: keith.a.headen@msg.ameritech.com

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of SBC Communications and/or its affiliates, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipients or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at 216-822-5518 and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

Attachment 18

From: Moore, Karen W, CSLSM [<mailto:kwmoore@att.com>]

Sent: Friday, February 28, 2003 2:12 PM

To: HEADEN, KEITH A (AIT)

Cc: EHR, JAMES D (SBC-MSI); SHEDLOCK, MARY (SBC-MSI); EWING, KATHLEEN (AIT); KROST, BECKY (SWBT); Deyoung, Sarah; Brown, Benjamin

Subject: RE: Data Reconciliation PM 39

Keith:

Per our discussion with Kate Ewing this morning, I would like to reconcile disposition codes 525 and 526 for data month of October 2002. I would like to start with MI (approximately 60 tickets).

I am available on Monday, Tuesday afternoon, and Wednesday morning. Please let me know who will be attending from SBC network.

Thanks, Keith.

Karen Moore

AT&T

708 579-3108